

Meeting Notes
Community Involvement Advisory Council
October 14, 2008
Appoquinimink State Service Center

Members Present (6): Dr. Bruce Allison, Robert Frederick, Dr. Jay Julis, La Vaida Owens-White, William E. Pelham, Marvin Thomas

Quorum is met.

Others Present: James Brunswick, Christina Wirtz and Vicki Ward

Members generally reviewed the CEPF report and discussed how Penalties are received in the CEPF account.

I. Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Bill Pelham opened the meeting.

Marvin Thomas inquired about the wording of the legislation for council member appointment and removal. La Vadia Owens-White mentioned there were instructions in the introductory packet received when first appointed. When the Governor makes the appointment you are obligated to serve so many times.

Bill asked for suggestions to get a quorum. It was decided a reminder phone call would be made by both Dr. Jay Julis and Vicki Ward. Marvin felt that individuals that have missed meetings should be asked if they want to continue. LaVaida agreed, stating an RSVP should be requested for meeting attendance. James should follow up with people that have missed sessions to see if their plate is getting too full. Bill requested Vicki to make these reminder phone calls. Jay said he would go back to calling people to remind. La Vaida questioned excused absences, if any more than three; the member should be contacted to see if they are still interested in coming.

II. Meeting Protocol Review

Bill requested members to be aware of the protocol as printed on the backs of the tent cards before each.

The meeting notes of the June 10, 2008 and the August 12, 2008 meetings were reviewed.

MOTION was made by Bob Fredrick to approve both the June 10 and the August 12, 2008 meeting notes; motion was second by Jay. All agreed and the notes were approved.

III. Community Environmental Project Fund

A. Proposed CEPF process revisions

B. Proposed CEPF Product revisions

James informed the proposed revisions were discussed with the Subcommittee. The first concern was about the proposed pre-application process. I tried to create, rather than a pre-application, on page 3, an application cover sheet. This will get the information needed; it will require me to follow up more. The cover sheet requests a history or track record of environmental projects, financials, and a bit more information about the organization. This cover sheet will enable us to shorten the cycle and to distribute funds in February. By the end of October, we can begin advertising the workshops and announce the funds will be available in February. In November we will hold the first of the workshops either here or in Smyrna.

Bill questioned if workshops would be held in each county. James noted that funds are scarce in Sussex County. The second workshop will be for Kent and Sussex.

Bill asked about the Grant and Aid. James noted we could add Sussex County in the next funding cycle. The issue will be the availability of funds. Perhaps new funds will be available in Sussex by then.

Bruce Allison noted we felt an obligation to cast the net to all three counties. The pre-application process was to ensure good applications, and cast the net farther.

La Vaida noted as far as location, all applicants are invited to the workshops.

Bill and Jay recalled talk about spreading the money on occasion, by taking upstate money to the lower counties. Marvin said it was discussed. Bob noted this is a gray area, David Small addressed the issue, the law doesn't allow it. James stated what the law allows is for the Secretary's discretion. If the council decided a project is worthwhile, it would be at the Secretary's discretion as to the award of funds.

Bill stated with general agreement, funds should be spread out. Do we want workshops in all three counties? Begin with one for the entire state in New Castle County and if applicants are truly interested they will get to the workshop.

Bob felt if three workshops were held, Sussex County would not have a well-attended workshop; suggesting one in New Castle and one centrally in Dover for both Kent and Sussex Counties.

Council members agreed it has been proven that regardless of where meetings have been held, applicants have come from all counties to make presentation requests. Bob added he had no feedback of any problems from Sussex County in regard to location. Bruce suggested trying once at two locations, indicating the issue may be more of how to contact interested parties and get the word out.

Bob considered the needs of nonprofit organizations. Jay felt all non-profit organizations are hurting, they will come if we make it convenient for a large area. He suggested starting with one for the entire state; if it is successful then conduct additional workshops. Marvin inquired whether this committee would be required to be present at the workshops. Bruce indicated if assistance is needed, date dependent, he would be available to help in Kent and Sussex Counties.

Bill – have 2, other comments.

MOTION – Dr. Bruce Allison made a motion to have two workshops, the first in New Castle County and the second as a combination of Kent and Sussex Counties. LaVadia second the motion all agreed and the motion passed.

James continued. The new application deadline would be January 5th 2009, this would allow time to review the applications and get notices to the applicants. The next meeting would be February 10th 2009, with the possibility of a new Secretary by then.

Once the Secretary approves projects, we will then initiate the contracts and purchase orders, working with fiscal, to be completed within a month's time. The contract year will begin May 1, 2009, that allows applicants 1 year and 30 days to get final reports in by June 15, 2010. Each year an annual report is sent to the Legislature and this will coincide with the fiscal year.

The benefits of a one-year cycle: allows more money to accumulate with distribution one time per year, and we get a better chance of a selection of projects with greater impact.

Jay asked when the checks go out, thinking of the planting season. James replied they are issued on a reimbursement basis. The applicants give us receipts. If applicants are prepared, reimbursement could be within a week to ten days, perhaps in mid April. Applicants must be ready. Bruce added this is contingent upon the pieces falling together appropriately.

LaVadia requested to go back to the DNREC sponsors; inquiring if there is sufficient staff to allow enough people to sponsor projects. James relayed this does depend on the demand on the department. Air Quality has a shortage of staff. It could happen, with the hiring freeze, and reductions, there are no plans for cuts in staff.

Christina Wirtz, DNREC Ombudsman present at the meeting, requested to speak. I have heard this does create quite a burden; it is a lot of effort. Drawing Council's attention to pages 4 and 5 of the Air and Waste Matters Newsletter which provides information on the Free Bike program sponsored by the CIAC. She advised that she knew work entailed many weekends and nights, personally and it is a big responsibility, the applicant does this happily, as it is a great program but it does take a toll. That's the inside story. Bill questioned, how can we help? Christina stated with more volunteers, there is a lot of generosity.

James added that some projects require sponsors to attend community meetings.

LaVadia reminded Council when we review applications; we need to identify the sponsors prior to approval. Marvin agreed if there is no sponsor, there is no contract.

Bill questioned; how do you stir up sponsors?

James replied we get summaries, and then I solicit each division.

Bill clarified that a shortened version was communicated in advance.

James, confirmed, yes, I'll really have to recruit.

Lava suggested if we can be made aware of the needs of staff, we have the volunteer link; there may be people across the state willing to get people out to help. The Office of Volunteerism is waiting to help.

James informed that the sponsors are subject matter experts. We need people with the expertise who can talk with the related organizations involved such as the Army Corp of Engineers.

Bill stated if top management such as John Hughes and David Small would lead the way and communicate the need for sponsors in house, you might get more help, with the request coming from the top. We may have more success if David puts his seal on it. James agreed, a key place to recruit is at the Division Director's meetings.

Christina stated; there also needs to be lead-time; staff needs to be able to plan properly to allow more dedication. If we need engineers, these are Subject Matter Experts, this means we are doing meaningful projects that require engineers, and they are substantial projects for all of Delaware.

Bruce questioned when applicants have come in without a sponsor, we have never discussed university personnel, they also have full plates, there is willingness, in the south we have the Earth and Marine Sciences, they do a fair amount of outreach. There is a pool to be tapped along the academic lines, for example technical expertise on wetlands construction; they would be just as appropriate.

Marvin agreed this is a good resource however raised one caution regarding the knowledge of DNREC policy and procedure.

Jay suggested the sponsor would still be under DNREC's preview, so it doesn't go awry. We could use university people for technical assistance, but keep the review under DNREC.

Bruce agreed knowing about permits is a difficulty as long as there is no conflict of interest. However there are untapped sources outside of DNREC to help lighten the load. We need to think broader.

James continued, the next idea is one grant per organization per year. In the past two organizations, Delaware Horticulture and the Transportation Management Association have received two grants. This would just be for equity, to make sure other groups get a

chance we limit 1 grant per year per organization. The Delaware Horticulture has continuously applied.

Bob advised and LaVadia agreed the subcommittee supported the one grant per organization per year criteria.

Jay added that before they can apply for another grant, they should have completed and submitted a final report.

MOTION – LaVadia made the motion that there be one grant per organization per year and no new grant will be considered until completion of the previous grant. Jay second the motion, all were in favor, the motion carried.

James moved to the next item; Enlarge grant review subcommittee with Subject Matter Experts. We need their input.

Jay questioned if these were state people and Bill questioned if the Subject Matter Experts would be included in the Subcommittee? James stated the subject matter experts would be recruited prior to the subcommittee. Marvin questioned if the experts and the sponsors are the same people, which James affirmed that yes, they are.

Bruce questioned if David could be involved. James affirmed that yes, in the Division Directors meeting will be a benefit to identify key subject matter experts with the Divisions.

James continued the two annual workshops have been approved by motion earlier.

Marvin questioned; in looking for experts/sponsors and if they can't be found, will you get back to applicant and let them know there is no sponsor, or let it come before the committee and say there is no SME.

James replied he preferred to let the applicant know up front, before notices. Marvin stated this is part of the information flowing from the workshops. Bob agreed stating the workshops may encourage applicants to get their own SME, work, and show at the committee meeting. Applicants should find sponsors themselves within DNREC.

Lavadia questioned if an applicant found someone outside of DNREC, would that person be entertained as a sponsor, but would still need someone from DNREC?

James replied that yes, Sponsors are responsible for approving internal invoices, reviewing expenditures, signing off that all is okay so that we can process reimbursements.

Jay noted that there is accountability for how the money is spent.

Marvin suggested; don't waiver from the DNREC sponsor.

Bruce stated someone signs off, but may not necessarily understand all the science behind it. We can still have non-DNREC heavily involved.

James agreed he could see working more with the Office of Volunteerism.

LaVadia stated that before an applicant was turned down due to the lack of a sponsor, the subcommittee would make a determination.

James moved on to the 25% matching requirement for any project – to insure the applicant has an investment. In looking at past grant programs, all have a matching.

MOTION – Jay made the motion, which was second by Bruce for the adoption of a 25% matching requirement for grants. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Bruce suggested that many people don't understand how their time can be layered in. This should be covered in the grant workshop. Jay agreed this was not covered in the application and volunteers should be considered.

Next James addressed the Proposed CEPF Product revisions, the \$25,000 capacity Building Small Grants, the Technical Assistance Grant and the Collaborative Problem-Solving Grant. All must meet the Community Environmental Fund criteria.

Bill questioned the environmental mission under Capacity-Building Grants. James assured we could only approve grants that are consistent with the Community Environmental Penalty Fund guidelines. But these projects can also serve the Community Involvement Advisory Council mission. For example, a capacity grant could help an applicant with an environmental enhancement project to achieve its goal, and then it does help our mission, assuring that no community is disparately affected.

La Vadia suggested this information be moved up front to achieve the community environmental mission. James agreed he would move that up so we could continue to meet the goals and objects of the fund.

Jay asked if applicants are limited to \$25,000 or less, one per county. James replied that yes, he is proposing one pilot grant for each county, then evaluating them to determine how successful we are in helping organizations to build capacity and build collaborative partnerships.

Jay asked if we would still offer one grant per county, but still offer the other grants as well. James replied yes, there are two kinds of grants, the CEPF grants and the capacity building grants.

James began a walk through of the application. I created an application cover sheet. The Technical Assistance Grant allows an organization that has research or training needs (as

identified on page 6) to contract with a Technical Assistance Provider. The Technical Assistance Provider must complete the Technical Assistance Provider Application and be approved by the CIAC.

Jay clarified that the Technical Assistance is if you need an engineer, then you can come back the next year and apply for another grant. Organizations must always show the matching money. Jay also noted we need to have a plan to make sure we get what is applied for.

James pointed out the requirements for an Interim Report and Final Report. The Technical Assistance Provider also provides a report to the CIAC members as well, prior to final allocation of funds. The TA Provider must provide: resume, samples of work products, workshop materials or handouts etc. Also copies of any work product produced for the applicant. We need documentation of their capabilities. .

Jay noted; that all sounds good.

Bill drew attention to the TA Provider Application on page 10, item 5, which lists the types of assistance. The first being One to One consulting. There are two other methods used: Multiple of Direct Personnel Expense and Stipulated (flat) Fee.

Jay questioned; so this is not an hourly type thing? Bill replied, no.

Marvin questioned; do we want to put hourly in? Bill replied; yes, as long as it is a few hours, as long as it is not too high, for example \$200 is okay.

Additional questions on the Technical Assistance Provider Application were asked, regarding spacing, tables, checkboxes and room for explanation of areas of expertise of provider. James agreed to make a note to attach addendums or to amend spacing and continue to fine-tune the draft document.

Marvin questioned the need for #9 and #10 on page 11 regarding non-English speaking experience and experience with working with groups of various race and ethnicity. James indicated many environmentally impacted, low-income communities are Spanish speaking. Marvin felt it could be one question rather than two, leaving out the ethnic note and just use Diverse Groups. Bruce and Bob both agreed this could be one question. Then just ask for further explanation of their experience.

James agreed, stating we may need to put more emphasis on the need for community outreach and involvement. I need to make this more prominent, have as a bullet, under technical assistance.

Bill made inquiries about 501C3 status and longevity, which James indicated was questioned on the cover sheet.

James continued the other capacity grant is for the development of Collaborative Problem- Solving Partnerships. It is difficult to resolve environmental issues at times because the issue falls under the jurisdiction of several different agencies. For example, Star Hill has a drainage problem, which involves DNREC, DelDOT, and Kent County sewer ordinances. Furthermore, in order for that community to address the problem it must work through the Comprehensive Planning process.

The aim is to build the community's capacity to solve the problem by building partnerships with all the responsible agencies. These partnership grants require the applicant to identify the problems, develop an appropriate response, involve and educate the community. Ideally, an organization can do all of this through a partnership in a one year grant and seek a Community Environmental Project Fund grant to complete the project the following year.

Jay asked James to notify council members of the November workshop. James agreed, stating he needed to finish the manual which council will get prior to the first workshop along with the agenda to all.

Bill confirmed the workshop is to be November 17th.

Bill requested a MOTION to approve the general package. Jay so moved, Bob and Lavadia both second the motion to go with the procedure as outlined.

Discussion:

James indicated with the council's approval he would now put together a finished product and can look toward November. Bob noted it was a working document that the subcommittee worked on.

Bill suggested if the answer can be put on the application page it saves the subcommittee time in finding the information. Everything you need is right there.

James said he would also have a checklist for each applicant to evaluate the application for completeness and then they can be ranked by project.

Christina questioned if there was a blank for the sponsor? James replied the regular application asks for the sponsor.

Bill confirmed all were in favor of the approval of the new process and product revisions. All being in favor the motion passed.

IV. CEPF Project Reports

V. Community Ombudsman Report

James announced that he had been selected for an EPA “Train the Trainer” session on Collaborative Problem-Solving Partnerships. It was quite an honor to be selected for one of the 30 slots. He was one of only two people selected from a state agency. The other trainees are all EPA mid level or senior staff.

The Pollution Control Strategy was likely to be signed by the Governor. Members of the Septic Financing Committee met to discuss implementation of the recommendations from the Septic Financing White Paper. The Paper contained a recommendation to establish a Task Force composed of DNREC, Sussex County government, banks, etc to determine the most efficient mix of central sewer, community systems on- site septic systems before working out the financing mechanism.

We recommended to Kathy Bunting Howarth, the Division of Water Resources Director, that we work through the Clean Water Advisory Council to establish a task force within its Finance Committee. The CWAC has the authority to tap 21st Century funds or to go to the legislature to request bond issues for funding. It makes sense to work through an established entity with the authority to seek state funding.

Asthma Project: Another division of Public Health is on board. The Maternal and Public Health section got a Title V Grant to establish an asthma program for the state. Alisa Olshefsky, the Section Chief, wants to work with this project to establish an asthma program. This is significant for the partnership and may even help in leveraging additional funds for the project.

We will also be able to make use of a DPH community level health survey. We could establish a base line health assessment for the Southbridge community.

Also, Public Health partnered with DNREC last year and got a grant for the Colonial School district to retrofit for school buses with filters to reduce diesel emissions. The district turned the funding down. The American Lung Association has brought funding for a school-based asthma project to the table. We will include school-based air monitoring in the project. Monitoring will be conducted at school, at home, and in the community. We hope to generate information for the Colonial school district that will lead it to accept future funding to retrofit their school bus fleet.

This can be a solid project with good outcomes for DNREC and DPH. Another possible outcome involves the Port of Wilmington. The Port was not complying with a Consent Order that involved retrofitting of off road vehicles loading materials on and off of ships at the port. We hope monitoring will pick up those emissions from those things and we may be able to generate information to get the Port to comply With the Colonial school bus retrofits, these can be really solid outcomes. .

VI. Open Forum

VII. Adjournment

Bill requested a MOTION to adjourn, Bruce so motioned, Jay second the motion, all approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Vicki E. Ward
Administrative Specialist III, DNREC

The notes of this meeting are not intended to be a verbatim record of the topics that were presented or discussed. They are for the use of the Community Involvement Advisory Council members and the public in supplementing their personal notes and recall for presentations.